

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. This sheet replaces the original filed sheet. In particular, Figure 1 has been amended to representatively show the “circuit” (corresponding to the ballast circuit or glow starter circuit), the “electrode ring”, and the “antenna”. Descriptive support for the “circuit” can be found in the specification on at least page 3, lines 25-34; and page 8, lines 25-30. Descriptive support for the “electrode ring” can be found in the specification on at least on page 4, lines 29-32; and page 9, lines 21-25. Descriptive support for the “antenna” can be found in the specification on at least on page 5, lines 2-5; and page 9, lines 26-30. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (1 / 3)

Annotated Sheet (1 / 3) Showing Changes

REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 have been amended. Claims 1-6 and 8-12 remain in the application. Support for the amendments to the claim can be found the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration, and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. By this amendment, Figure 1 has been amended to representatively show the "circuit" (corresponding to the ballast circuit or glow starter circuit), the "electrode ring", and the "antenna". No new matter has been added. Descriptive support for the "circuit" can be found in the specification on at least page 3, lines 25-34; and page 8, lines 25-30. Descriptive support for the "electrode ring" can be found in the specification on at least on page 4, lines 29-32; and page 9, lines 21-25. Descriptive support for the "antenna" can be found in the specification on at least on page 5, lines 2-5; and page 9, lines 26-30. Accordingly, the objection is now believed overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly point out "ignition-related events" as "corresponding to ignition behavior of the discharge lamp" that "can give rise to ignition-related damage on" the electrodes. Support for the amendment to claim 2 can be found in the specification at least on page 2, lines 21-24, 30-34; page 6, lines 23-26; and page

8, lines 8-14.

Claim 9 has been amended to more clearly point out “wherein a temperature of the one electrode is 20% lower than the average temperature of the electrodes under normal operating conditions of the lamp”. Support for the amendment to claim 9 can be found in the specification at least on page 9, lines 11-17.

The respective claims are now rendered to more clearly particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-8 and 10-12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Allowability of claims 7-8 and 10-12 is noted with appreciation.

In lieu of rewriting claim 7 in independent form, the limitations of claim 7 have been incorporated into amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is now in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

Claim 8 has been amended to be in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim. Accordingly, claim 8 is now in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

Claim 10 has been amended to be in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim. Accordingly, claim 10 is now in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from and add further limitations to allowable claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11 and 12 are now in *prima facie* condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Soules et al (US 6,809,477 B2). With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons. Claim 1 has been amended to include recitation of the limitations of the allowable subject matter of claim 7 (now canceled). Accordingly, claim 1 is in *prima facie* condition for allowance. Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the Soules reference and should be withdrawn.

With respect to claims 2-5, the same depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well.

Accordingly, claims 1-5 are allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. The 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soules in view of Moerkens (U.S. 3,740,609). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to claim 6, the same depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 1. Accordingly, claim 6 is thus allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. The 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

Claim 9 depends from and further limits allowable claim 1. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested.

Conclusion

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce

subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claims 1, 8 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-6, 9 and 11-12 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings; therefore, no new matter is introduced. An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-12 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291
for Frank Keegan, Reg. No. 50,145

Dated: Sept. 1, 2007

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9669
Facsimile: 914-332-0615
File: NL030915US1

ATTACHMENTS

a-32658.162